

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/534,299	05/09/2005	Michel Strebelle	271730US0PCT	9792	
22850 7590 11/08/2007 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET			EXAMINER		
			KEYS, ROSALYND ANN		
ALEXANDRIA	ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1621		
	•				
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			11/08/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon:com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/534,299	STREBELLE ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Rosalynd Keys	1621		

	Rosalynd Keys	1621	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>10/29/07</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICA	TION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOW	VANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aft tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in (fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejecti	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7		E FIRST REPLY WAS F	ILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
AMENDMENTS			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) 	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rei	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		•	` ,
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	lowable if submitted in a separate,	•	_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attacl	hed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	it does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	Rosafad (by
		! Rosalyrid Keys Primary Examiner	-

Art Unit: 1621

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The rejection of claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takehisa (JP 04327582) in view of Strebelle et al. (US 6,288,248 BI).

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Examiner believes that claims 1-16 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Strebelle et al. (US 6,288,248 Bl) in view of Takehisa (JP 04327582) for the reasons of record. With regard to Applicants arguments regarding inherency only applying to anticipation rejections, the Examiner directs Applicants' attention to the following taken directly form MPEP 2112: The express, implicit, and inherent disclosures of a prior art reference may be relied upon in the rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. 102 or 103. "The inherent teaching of a prior art reference, a question of fact, arises both in the context of anticipation and obviousness." In re Napier, 55 F.3d 610, 613, 34 USPQ2d 1782, 1784 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (affirmed a 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection based in part on inherent disclosure in one of the references). See also In re Grasselli, 713 F.2d 731, 739, 218 USPQ 769, 775 (Fed. Cir. 1983).